

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-19-2003

An exploratory study to determine procedures for implementation and evaluation of pupil assistance committees

Joyce E. Klemic
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Klemic, Joyce E., "An exploratory study to determine procedures for implementation and evaluation of pupil assistance committees" (2003). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1332.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1332>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact graduateresearch@rowan.edu.

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY TO DETERMINE PROCEDURES FOR
IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEES

By
Joyce E. Klemic

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree
Of
The Graduate School
At
Rowan University
May 5, 2003

Approved by _____

Date Approved May 19, 2003

© 2003 Joyce E. Klemic

ABSTRACT

Joyce E. Klemic

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY TO DETERMINE PROCEDURES FOR
IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEES

2002-2003

Dr. Stanley Urban

Master of Arts in Learning Disabilities

Literature related to Pupil Assistance Committees indicates they were established to increase the capacity of regular education to serve pupils with learning and behavior problems without labeling them as handicapped. New Jersey mandates the establishment of Intervention and Referral Services which are “ a coordinated system in each building for the planning and delivery of intervention and referral services designed to assist students who are experiencing learning, behavior and health difficulties and to assist staff who have difficulties in addressing students’ learning, behavior or health needs”.

(N.J.A.C. 6A: 16-7.1)

The purpose of this study was to identify effective model of a Pupil Assistance Committee/Intervention and Referral Service, and to determine what types of interventions are most successful and what are the most important benefits of an effective Pupil Assistance Committee (PAC). A specific district, with two Kindergartens through Fourth Grade PAC’s in effect was examined to determine types of referrals made to the PAC, as well as the interventions recommended. Subsequent Referrals to Child Study Team were also tracked to determine effectiveness and appropriateness of the

interventions. The teachers' perceptions of their building's PAC services were surveyed and a list of recommendations created based on the information gathered.

The results of the survey noted inconsistency between the two schools of teachers' perceptions of the usefulness and effectiveness of PAC's. Teachers' perceptions were found to be positive if referral to the Child Study Team was expedited. There was also inconsistency between the two schools as to the team's practices related to parental contact and types of interventions implemented. Tutoring was found to be the most often recommended and easily documented intervention, as well as the intervention that achieved the most positive results. Based on the literature review and the results of this study, a coordinated PAC reform is warranted for the district involved in this study.

MINI-ABSTRACT

Joyce E. Klemic

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY TO DETERMINE PROCEDURES FOR
IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEES
2002/2003

Dr. Stanley Urban

Master of Arts in Learning Disabilities

The purpose of this study is to identify what is accepted as the most effective model of a Pupil Assistance Committee/Intervention and Referral Service, and to determine what types of interventions are most successful and what are the most important benefits of an effective Pupil Assistance Committee (PAC). Teachers' perceptions were found to be positive if referral to the Child Study Team was expedited. Findings from survey and record review showed that interventions that were intense and directly related to the problem were most successful. Results indicated an increased quantity of instruction to be an effective intervention.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express her gratitude to the many family and friends who have made this thesis project possible.

In particular, she would like to thank her children for giving her the drive to succeed and allowing her to be a positive academic role model, even if they didn't want one.

Also, she would like to thank Dr. Stanley Urban for the patience, good humor and great ideas that kept her thesis moving in a positive direction and to fruition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	
Background.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Value of the Study.....	5
Need for the Study.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	7
Research Questions.....	8
Definitions.....	8
Limitations.....	10
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
CHAPTER III: DESIGN OF THE STUDY	
Introduction.....	21
Population.....	21
Method of Sample Selection.....	22
Instrumentation.....	22
Collection of Data.....	23
Research Design and Analysis of Data.....	24
CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	
Introduction	26

Results of Open-Ended Questions.....	27
Results of Rating Scale.....	33
Analysis of PAC Records.....	38
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	
Summary.....	42
Conclusion.....	43
Discussion and Implications.....	44
Recommendations.....	46
REFERENCES.....	48
APPENDICES.....	49

Chapter I

Introduction

Background

Christiansen (1997) stated the following:

An increasing number of children in today's classrooms are at risk for school failure as a result of changes in family structure, increased violence, abuse and neglect, substance abuse and disabilities. Many of these children thrive with the support and guidance teachers provide in the classroom. However, the classroom community contains children with so many complex needs that it is difficult for teachers to meet individual needs effectively without the support of the entire school community.

His statement provides an indication of the broad acknowledgement that it will be necessary to take a collaborative approach to meet the needs of the current student population. Pupil Assistance Committee (PAC), Teacher Assistance Teams (TAT), Intervention and Referral Services (I & RS), Pre-referral Interventions.... the names may vary, but the focus is the same. Each is a different title for a collaborative approach to problem solving in order to help students and teachers deal with a variety of concerns that effect school performance.

The state of New Jersey Board of Education, on July 1, 1992 mandated that school districts establish Pupil Assistance Committees in each school by the beginning of

the 1994-1995 school year. According to the N.J.A.C. Title 6:26-1.1, “ Pupil Assistance Committees (PAC) are school based teams which design and monitor the implementation of strategies for educating non-classified pupils who are referred because they are experiencing difficulties in their classes. Pupil Assistance Committees coordinate and/or deliver intervention and referral services for these pupils, and develop and annual Pupil Assistance Committee Report describing the needs and issues identifies through referral to the committee.” (N.J.A.C. 6:26) (See Appendix A)

In April 1982, an extensive review of New Jersey’s system for providing special education programs and services was conducted. The New Jersey Special Education Study Commission was created for this purpose. In January 1985, the findings and recommendations of that committee were presented to the State Board of Education entitled, The Turning Point: New Directions in Special Education (Salgado, 1992). The concerns noted in this report included an over reliance on special education because regular education did not adequately serve the regular education students, a lack of communication between regular and special education, reliance on a system of special education that labels children by their disability rather than focus on their educational needs, and limited flexibility in providing special education services at the school building level.

Based on this information, a Plan to Revise Special Education in New Jersey was developed. One of the major goals of the plan was to increase the capacity of regular education to serve pupils with learning and behavior problems without labeling them as handicapped. The School Resource Committee (SRC) pilot initiative was formed with two purposes in mind: the first was to design and recommend interventions for non-

handicapped pupils. Second, the SRC was to develop annual recommendations for building improvement plans. This plan was carried out from 1987 to 1990 with constructive results for both students and teachers, for example, inappropriate referrals to special education were reduced and more support was provided to teachers at the regular education level for troubled students. In addition, teacher's instructional and behavioral techniques improved and teacher became more aware of the needs of their pupils. The SRC gave the teachers a place to go for support and assistance. The districts became more aware of the needs of the pupils in their own buildings as communication increased between staff and administration. The Pupil Assistance Committee regulations were modeled after the SRC pilot initiative, and went into effect on July 1, 1992.

According to the N.J.A.C. 6A: 16-7.1 "Establishment of intervention and referral services, district boards of education shall establish and implement a coordinated system in each school building for the planning and delivery of intervention and referral services that are designed to assist students who are experiencing learning, behavior or health difficulties and to assist staff who have difficulties in addressing students' learning behavior or health needs."

The one difference of the PAC compared to the I&RS is that the former specifically limits the services to regular education students, where I &RS services includes special education students as able to receive the services of the I & RS.

Specifically, it is stated in N.J.A.C. 6A: 16-7.1 that :

- 1.The intervention and referral services shall be provided to aid students in the general education program; and

2. The intervention and referral services, pursuant to N. J.S.A. 18A:46-18.1 et seq. and this subchapter, may be provided for students who have been determined to be in need of special education programs and services,
 - i. The intervention and referral services provided for students with learning disabilities shall be coordinated with the student's Individualized Education Program, as appropriate.

This is important because teachers need to see that each student belongs to the same school population and strategies that work for regular education students also work for special education student. A child that is classified as a learning disabled student, may exhibit behaviors unrelated to that disability, like a family or health problem and may need the expertise of those trained to deal with that particular problem. Pupil Assistance Committees should be utilizing the services of various professionals or outside agencies and that the case manager for that student may not have.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify the most effective model of a Pupil Assistance Committee/ Intervention and Referral Service, to determine types of interventions that are most successful and the most important benefits of an effective PAC. A specific district that has three PAC's in will be examined in detail. Types of referrals will be evaluated and the number of Child Study Team Referrals will be documented. The teachers' perceptions of those PAC services will be surveyed and a needs assessment created. This assessment will have recommendations for the district's

PAC based upon the results of this survey and on the existing accepted professional literature.

Value of the Study

This study will be useful in assisting a specific school district in strengthening their interventions services and to better meet the needs of changing community demographics. Appropriate training can be made available to committee members and to teachers in general based on a needs analysis, which is implicit in the research strategy. It may also serve as a resource for other districts in establishing an effective intervention model.

Need for the Study

It is important to strengthen the use of PAC's and pre-referral interventions for a number of reasons. First, it can save time and money by limiting the CST resources required. Pupil Assistance Committees, when properly implemented, are cost saving, beneficial to special education and regular education students; and, second it is a good method of forming a collegial bond between regular and special education teachers and administrative personnel.

Once a referral to the Child Study Team has been made, a legally mandated timelines go into effect and must be adhered to. In a study by Burns (1999), he noted that a 1988 United States Department of Education report to Congress cited 21 of 24 surveyed states for noncompliance because of a failure to of consider regular education alternatives

before removing students for special education. Data shows that the number of IDEA eligible students continues to grow at a rate higher than school enrollment. (Naquin and Adler, 2002). The need for a prereferral intervention model becomes apparent when one examines these figures. Intervention teams can do much of the background work, collecting files and report cards before a child is referred for special education services. They can implement interventions that may make referral unnecessary. The results of these interventions can become evaluative in nature and lead the teachers to confidently make a referral to special education if warranted. Many students never require the services of the CST; but may need attention and special services to handle a myriad of school difficulties that can arise. Some of the problems exhibited by students are chronic, while others are temporary, but any problem a student faces that limits their potential to learn is the concern of the child's teacher and the entire school community.

The creation of a successful learning environment may also have the effect of helping students remain in the least restrictive environment, which is a requirement of IDEA. A strong PAC is also important to help the teachers who sometimes feel they are being bombarded with a host of complex problems that they feel unequipped to handle. Collaboration among professionals is especially important as the movement for inclusion becomes stronger and more students are served in the general education classrooms. (Whitten and Duker, 1995)

The district involved in this study is undergoing rapid population change. As many of the apartments have become subsidized, low income housing; consequently, the district is experiencing an increase of minority students and lower socioeconomic status students. The teachers who have been working in the district for a number of years

are being presented with issues that they have not experienced in the past. Support and training is needed to assist these teachers in addressing a wider range of learning abilities and styles.

Significance of the Study

A common perception among teachers is that Pupil Assistance Committees are merely a way to delay referral to special education. A well-designed study with useful recommendations and ideas will help to provide prereferral interventions that are meaningful. Only when teachers accept the interventions suggested, will they be used with fidelity. A study by Naquin and Adler (1998) found that all teachers in their sample reported that they had conducted interventions as planned, but when directly observed it was found that the teachers really only implemented the interventions 4% of the time. If the teachers bought into this process, they would surely put more effort into trying the interventions.

It is also important to identify the most useful strategies to help students and teachers meet with success. Teachers and administration need to see that their work has not been in vain. A system that tracks these interventions can be very motivating for the teacher if those interventions are successful. Many of the studies show which strategies were most frequently used, but do not necessarily document their effectiveness. (Whitten, 1995)

Research Questions

In order to accomplish the general purpose of this study, the following research questions will be answered:

Question 1: Are Pupil Assistance Committees useful in preventing referral to Special Education?

Question 2: Do teachers have a true understanding of the purpose of PAC?

Question 3: What professionals should sit on the PAC?

Question 4: Is PAC merely a hurdle between the student and special education referral?

Question 5: What pre-referral strategies are used most frequently?

Question 6: What pre-referral strategies produce the most positive results?

Question 7: How can the success or failure of PAC strategies be assessed?

Definition

Theorist and researchers use a variety of names for the intervention and referral teams described in this study. For the purposes of this study, these terms will be used interchangeably, but refer to a collaborative team approach to meeting the needs of the students and teachers in the general education classrooms.

The following terms have a specialized definition within the context of this study:

Assessment - those procedures used by school staff to make a preliminary determination of a student's need for educational programs, supportive services or referral for outside

services which extend beyond the general education program by virtue of learning, behavioral or health difficulties of the student or the student's family. (NJAC 6A:16-1.3)

Evaluation - those procedures used by a certified or licensed professional to make a positive determination of a student's need for programs and services which extend beyond the general school program by virtue or learning, behavior or health difficulties of the student or the student's family. (NJAC 6A:16-1.3)

Intervention - means those programs, service sand actions taken to identify and offer help to a student at risk for learning, behavior or health difficulties. (NJAC 6A:16-1.3)

Parent - means the natural parent(s), or adoptive parent(s), legal guardian(s), foster parent(s) or parent surrogate(s) of a student. Where parents are separated or divorced, "parent" means the person or agency that has legal custody of the student, as well as the natural or adoptive parent(s) of the student, provided the parental rights have not been terminated by a court of appropriate jurisdiction. (NJAC 6A:16-1.3)

Referral for Evaluation - those programs and services offered to a student or his or her family in order to make a positive determination regarding a student's need for services which extend beyond the general school program. (NJAC 6A:16-1.3)

Limitations

The findings of this study should be generalized with caution for the following reasons:

First, the literature related to PAC's does not measure pupil achievement. There are not controlled studies, instead anecdotal reports results in information not as scientifically reliable as one would like. A "halo" effect, sometimes occurs when surveying team members who may report their achievement as higher than actual. (Safran, 1996) Team members look upon their success as greater than it actually may be.

In the school district where the present study was conducted, there was inconsistency between schools in terms of record keeping as it related to PAC's. Also, data was available only for the period of September 2001 to March 2003.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

General and special education teachers are being challenged to support increasing numbers of students with learning or behavior problems in general education classrooms. In response to these problems state education agencies have instituted a variety of programs to better support students experiencing school problems. By the late 1980's over one half of the State Education Agencies had mandated or recommended the forming of school based collaborative teams developed to aid the students and teachers (Ormsbee, Haring, 2000). Research articles related to this topic refer to these teams under a variety of titles, such as pre-assessment, pre-referral, teacher assistance or student assessment teams. In New Jersey, they are known as intervention and referral services (NJAC 6A: 16). Recommendations among the researchers are in agreement regarding many aspects of these teams. Some variables to be examined are the personnel on the team, how often they should meet, how the team is organized, how the interventions are monitored, and problems faced by teams related to population served or geographic location.

The pre-referral process involves several steps. Generally, the teacher, who expresses concerns about a particular child's academic or behavioral performance, refers the student to the pre-referral team. Then, that teacher meets with the team to discuss the concerns and then discusses the interventions and results. Next, the teacher and members of the team engage in problem solving activities to help the teacher with the concerns.

The team may meet again in a week or two to discuss the results of the interventions. Typically, interventions are implemented for six to nine weeks to determine their effectiveness. At some point, changes or continuation of the interventions may be recommended by the team. If the pre-referral interventions are successful, the student will not be referred to the Child Study Team. The composition of PAC's varies across schools. Typically, a team includes three to five members with at least one being a general education teacher, a special education teacher and the teacher who made the referral. Some schools involve parents as part of the team. (Hammond and Ingalls, 1999). The principal and other professionals are often included on the PAC.

Although the code does not specify who should serve on the team it does state that, "the district board of education shall establish guidelines for the involvement of school staff community members in each building's system of intervention and referral services." It also provides the district board of education the authority to identify the roles and responsibilities of the staff who will be involved in the planning of intervention and referral services They are also to identify the roles and responsibilities of other staff for aiding in the development and implementation of those plans and for setting the parameters for the participation of community members aiding in the intervention and referral actions plans (N.J.A.C. 6A: 16-7.1).

In 1992, the N.J.A.C 6:26-2.2 was more specific regarding who should serve on the multidisciplinary PAC team. It states that, at a minimum, the team shall be composed of the building principal or someone with the authority to implement the recommendations of the team, a regular education teacher, and one school staff member from one of the following titles: Guidance Counselor, Learning Disabilities Teacher

Consultant, School Social Worker, School Nurse, School Psychologist, Speech and Language Specialist or a Substance Awareness Coordinator.

Using special education teachers on the team has been controversial. Some researchers felt the approach should first involve regular education teachers. (Burns, 1999). In a study of rural pre-assessment teams by Ornsbee and Haring (2000), it was noted that special education teachers usually did not serve on the teams in their study since it is considered a general education collaborative procedure. According to Burns (1999) 25 intervention assistance teams were surveyed. They found that students who attended schools with special education teachers on their teams had a lesser chance of being retained or referred to special education than those who attended schools without this model.

In a survey of 520 intervention team members in Michigan, Illinois and Wisconsin, administrators, school psychologists and special education teachers were listed as the team members who most often led discussion, were the most effective communicators and were knowledgeable about academic and behavioral interventions. Special education teachers have expertise in remediating academic and behavioral concerns while school psychologists are trained in instructional strategies, human behavior, school organization, assessment and consultation. Psychologists were preferred over guidance counselor because of their training in educational psychology as opposed to counseling psychology (Burns, 1999).

The Association of School Psychologist of Pennsylvania (1999), in a position paper on the revision of Pennsylvania special education regulations, stated that school psychologists should serve on pre-referral teams since they have always been involved in

the multidisciplinary team that assesses for special education eligibility. School psychologists have special skills required to help the team determine whether the student is potentially eligible for special education or if the problems are due to curricular or instructional difficulties.

Researchers have found that using pre-referral intervention teams is not merely mandated, but is considered a preferred educational practice within the schools. These teams have been used successfully to help regular education teachers with academic and behavioral concerns and also are useful in reducing the number of referrals to special education. (Hammond and Ingalls, 1999) The effectiveness of intervention teams varies based upon many factors. In a survey of team effectiveness published by Chalfont and Pysch, in which 23 teams responded, members of 11 teams (48%) believed their teams were very effective; six teams (26%) believed they were moderately effective and six teams (26%) thought they were occasionally effective. Results of rural school districts' pre-referral teams survey indicate that they perceive themselves as a very effective support system for their colleagues. Teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of pre-assessment overall indicated that teachers were satisfied with the pre-assessment teams as an effective support process. However, teacher reaction was mixed as to whether the pre-assessment team was actually successful in resolving student achievement problems. It was viewed more as a superficial system that provides short-term relief for teachers and students, but not long-term solutions for the problems that students face (Ormsbee and Haring, 2000).

Chalfant and Pycsh (1985) identified three major factors as contributing to team effectiveness. The principal in 21 of the 23 teams surveyed was cited as a key factor.

Principals are able to provide release time for their team members and their enthusiasm and support make the teams function successfully. They are also able to make the necessary financial arrangements for books, materials and in-services. Sixty –five percent (15 out of 23 teams) listed team attributes and performance as reasons for their effectiveness. Team members were well trained in procedures and operating a team. Team members had varied range of expertise and their leaders were considered excellent. The members were excited about their work, interacted well and worked to make the team effective. The team members had good relationships with the teachers and were able to generate workable intervention strategies.

Faculty support was mentioned by 11 of the 23 teams (48%). Teams were effective when teachers requested assistance from the teams, attended the meetings and cooperated with the teams and implemented their suggestions. Conversely, 14 of the 23 teams (61%) viewed limited teacher support as a factor in reducing team effectiveness. Some teachers reported that not only were teachers reluctant to implement interventions, which were viewed as “additional work”, but that the faculty did not understand the purpose or the role of the intervention team (Chalfont and Pysch, 1989). Teams rely heavily on teacher report. In an article on pre-referral strategies by Naquin and Adler (2002), they stated that, in a 1998 study by Wickstom, all of the teachers in their sample reported conducting interventions with integrity. Direct observation, on the other hand, revealed that the teacher implemented the interventions only 4% of the time. Sometimes, it is difficult to tell if a pre-referral intervention was not effective or not properly implemented. Poor treatment integrity can result in a well-planned intervention to function ineffectively (Mortenson). Best practice demands that planned interventions be

implemented correctly. A halfhearted attempt at remediation is not professional behavior. The state of Minnesota stresses the “instructional fidelity is an imperative, not a luxury” (Shriner and Spicuzza, 1995).

Properly implemented pre-referral interventions afford several protections to the child. Efforts directed toward pre-referral interventions help to ensure that the child is educated in the least restrictive environment and that an effort has been made to educate the child in the general education classroom. Requiring pre-referral interventions reduces the possibility that teacher referral, which is the most important variable contributing to special education placement, is not derived from whim or lack of tolerance. Also, interventions, when properly developed and carried out may also provide valuable assessment data. This data can be useful in determining whether a child’s problem is a skill or a performance deficit (Mortenson and Witt, 1998). Instruction and assessment must be clearly connected and, according to IDEA, all persons have the right to demonstrate their skills and competencies and should be given adequate opportunity to learn the material required of them (Shriner and Spicuzza, 1995). The results of interventions, even if there is ultimately referral to special education, can be useful in designing the Individual Education Plan and make modifications to be used in the general education and special education classrooms.

Intervention teams require training in order to be effective. Without proper training, teams tend to function inefficiently and ultimately unsuccessfully. Members need to be trained in understanding the team concept and what roles each member plays on that team. They also need training in analyzing problems, establishing interventions goals and generating practical, usable plans. Intervention team members need to

communicate effectively (to each other and to other staff members). Interpersonal skills are crucial for acceptance of their recommendations. On-going trainings can provide members with fresh perspectives and can contribute to team longevity (Chalfont and Pysch,1989). In an eight-year longitudinal study of 10 pre-referral teams, the success of the 8 teams that endured was related to formal training and on-going in-service opportunities that had been provided (Hammond and Ingalls, 1999).

Much of the literature on school pre-assessment teams describes implementation in elementary schools, but growing needs at the secondary level make collaborative problem solving a much-needed vehicle. There are some very specific problems which are unique to intervention teams at the secondary level. Junior highs and middle schools also have many of the same issues due to the departmentalized nature of most buildings.

The number of teachers and class periods makes implementation of interventions and the communication necessary very difficult. It is often difficult to assemble all the necessary members for the meeting in order to develop the strategies. The paperwork involved is oppressive according to one researcher and it sometimes occurs that fewer referrals are made in order to avoid the time and paperwork involved. Many teachers can tolerate a problem for one short period a day and, therefore, don't look for assistance to change the problem. They merely look for the end of the class period. At the high school level, pre-referral time was considered as time lost. By the time a child has gotten to high school many interventions have already been tried and failed and the child should be referred immediately to child study team. It was noted during the high school years that it is difficult to tell the difference between student deficit and student defiance (Myers and Kline, 2001,2002).

Secondary school teachers also have high expectations for their students and look at them more as adults than children. They view these years as the time where they need to demonstrate that they are able to do the work or not do it. To make accommodations for these students would be considered “making exceptions” and it would be unfair, since high school grades are so competitive. Some secondary education teachers feel the need to “weed out” students who “don’t belong in school”. These teachers see intervention implementation as an interference with the natural process of eliminating students who should not be in high schools. On the opposite side of the coin, the “keep kids in school” teachers hold intervention assistance as an opportunity to make secondary school an acceptable environment for students who would otherwise surrender and quit (Myers and Kline, 2001,2002).

Urban schools have problems unique to their geographic location and socioeconomic level. They can be at a disadvantage in implementing student intervention teams because of the scarcity of resources needed to support the procedures. Rural schools are continually challenged to recruit both general and special education teachers and support personnel. Also, many urban districts are at a considerable distance from metropolitan areas where universities and colleges are located. They are not involved in research projects and program development opportunities at the same rate as their urban and suburban counterparts. These long distances also limit the availability of staff attaining advanced degrees or additional certifications. Urban districts, on the other hand, may have access to the opportunities available in a large city, but come with their own distinct problems. Poverty, minority students and frequent lack of parental

involvement bring a multitude of problems to the classrooms and challenge even the best teachers.

According to Whitten (1995) the most frequently used interventions strategies in their study were counseling, instructional modifications and behavioral modifications. However, that particular survey did not describe the effectiveness of those interventions. In Whitten's (1995) article, he reports that the most frequently used strategies he found were individualized instruction, consultation, behavior management techniques and parent conferences. But, again, their effectiveness was not documented. It is considered difficult for educators to collect meaningful data when looking to prove effectiveness. (Shriner and Spicuzza, 1995). There are many variables that come into play when discussing interventions.

In a survey of 23 teams, the most frequently used and the most successful interventions were listed in order of frequency. (Whitten and Dicker, 1995). They are listed in order from most frequently used to least frequently used and from most to least successful.

<u>Most Frequently Used Intervention</u>	<u>Most Successful Intervention</u>
1. behavior management	1. behavior management
2. curricular modification	2. peer tutoring
3. individualized instruction	3. individualized instruction
4. small group instruction	4. small group instruction
5. peer tutoring	5. consultation with professionals
6. consultation with professionals	6. teacher/student conferences
7. teacher observations	7. teacher observations
8. cooperative learning	8. cooperative learning

When intervention integrity is high, there is a better chance of an intervention being successful. In a study by Mortenson and Witt,(1998), they found that the use of weekly performance feedback increased the teacher's implementation of the prereferral academic interventions.

Chapter III

Design of the Study

Introduction

This study is being carried out in order to improve the pre-referral intervention process of a pre-kindergarten through eighth grade school district, which is undergoing a rapid change in its population. These changes are related to race and economic level and have brought about a new array of needs. These needs have not been previously identified or addressed except through the Special Education Department. The Pupil Assistance Committee is able to address the needs of the entire school population regardless of a student's classification status. From studying the types of referrals, the response to those referrals and by monitoring the opinions regarding the effectiveness of those interventions, recommendations can be made to improve the status of the Pupil Assistance Committee in this school district.

Population

This study will be conducted in a small town with approximately 12,000 full time residents. The town has two public schools, one Christian school and one Catholic school. The two public schools are School One, which is comprised of students from P-K to 6th grade and School Two which is comprised of students from P-K to grade eight.

This study will be focusing on the K-6 students. All of the students in the district attend the School Two when they reach Junior High regardless of their address. The students are divided geographically, with some economic disparity between the two schools. The population at School Two is 18% free lunch eligible while School One is 32% free lunch eligible. The city is comprised of single houses with numerous apartment complexes. The majority of the students, who are of the lowest income and of the highest minority rate, live in the apartments and attend School One.

Method of Sample Selection

A convenience sample was used for this study. Only the Pupil Assistance Committee referrals from the kindergarten through sixth grade were selected because School Two houses all of the seventh and eighth grade students. Comparisons could not be made from one team to the other as could be done with the younger students.

A survey contained in Appendix B was distributed to the teachers from the district. All of the teachers in the district were asked to complete the survey, regardless of full or part time status, regular or special education teacher, grade level or subject area taught. The responses will be divided by the school the teacher works in, with those teachers who move from school to school being assigned randomly, but in equal numbers between the two schools.

Instrumentation

No standardized testing has been used in order to conduct this study; therefore there are no specific reliability or validity numbers related to student achievement. Data concerning the Pupil Assistance Committee referrals will be collected and evaluated using simple mathematical comparisons for the numbers of referrals to the Pupil Assistance Committee and then to the Child Study Team; and when comparing data from one school to the other. The survey instrument presents face validity since the questions directly gauge of the teacher's confidence, or lack of confidence in their school's Pupil Assistance Committee.

Collection of Data

The principals who implement the Pupil Assistance Committees will be interviewed and the records of those committees reviewed. Numbers of students who were referred to the Pupil Assistance Committee will be documented along with the interventions implemented and the success of those interventions. The number of students who were then referred on to the Child Study Team will be identified and then the number of those students who were ultimately classified will be noted. These records will be compared across the schools. The interventions utilized for those students will also be reviewed to see if patterns of success or failure can be identified.

Surveys will be distributed to each teacher with a cover letter from the principals stating a deadline for return, the anonymity of their responses and a request for frank and open responses. The teachers will also be informed that the results of their survey will be

made available to them and that their responses will be utilized in making appropriate changes to the Pupil Assistance Committees. Surveys are to be sent directly to each principal's office. The Junior High School surveys, although not a direct part of this study will also be collected and recommendations made to their PAC, reflective of their teachers opinions.

Research Design and Analysis of Data

After completion of analysis of the available records, rates of student referrals from one school will be compared to those of the other school. Successful interventions will be identified, as well as unsuccessful interventions. Child Study Team referral rates will be compared from one school to the next. Referral rates will also be examined to see what types of problems will produce a Child Study Team referral.

Analysis of the survey results will be conducted comparing each question from school to school. Subgroups will also be identified where appropriate, such as regular education vs. special education teachers or content area teachers vs. homeroom teachers. Interventions identified by the teachers will be listed from most used to least used. Successful interventions will be similarly listed and then compared to the most used interventions. This study will seek to determine if concordance exists between what the Pupil Assistance Committee chooses for interventions, which interventions are considered useful by the teachers; and which interventions actually produce positive results.

When all of the results are compiled, a needs assessment will be developed based upon the teacher's overall satisfaction of their Pupil Assistance Committee, the most

appropriate interventions used and which interventions should be avoided.

Recommendations based upon teacher comment will be listed when relevant.

Recommendations from the review of literature will also be incorporated into the report in order to develop a more successful district wide Pupil Assistance Committee.

Chapter IV

Analysis of the Data

Introduction

In order to accomplish the goals of this study, surveys were distributed to all of the teachers in the school district involved in this study, including regular education, special education and special area teachers from grades K-6. There were two schools within this district. The data was disaggregated and reported, both by school and then as a district.

A record review of the Pupil Assistance Committee from each school was also conducted to determine if patterns in interventions were present and the number of referral made to the Child Study Team. These results were also reported for individual schools and for the district as a whole.

This information is being compiled in order to address the following questions:

Question 1: Are Pupil Assistance Committees useful in preventing referral to special education?

Question 2: Do teachers have a true understanding of the purpose of PAC?

Question 3: What professionals should sit on the PAC?

Question 4: Is PAC merely a hurdle between the student and special education referral?

Question 5: What pre-referral strategies are used most frequently?

Question 6: What pre-referral strategies produce the most positive results?

Question 7: How can the success or failure of PAC strategies be assessed?

Results

Results of Open-Ended Questions

Due to the open-ended nature of these questions, the responses had to be grouped into general areas of concern. In some cases there was some overlap of response.

Question 1: What do you believe to be the primary function of the Pupil Assistance Committee?

In general most of the respondents realized that PAC was a vehicle for students who were struggling. Implicit in the teachers' responses was their awareness that it was a regular education initiative and that the purpose is to help both students and teachers. Five percent of the respondents reported that PAC was also an aid to parents. Twenty-five percent of the respondents consider PAC to be a vehicle that leads directly to Child Study Team referral. There was no significant disparity between the two schools as to what they thought the goals of the PAC were. In addressing the research question that asks, "Do teachers have a true understanding of the purpose of PAC?", it appears that the majority of teachers who responded to this survey were aware of the stated intent of PAC.

They understood that it was an arena for sharing information and helping students and teachers to deal with classroom problems and issues. A minority of teachers, 25% felt that PAC was related to the Child Study Team more than a regular education initiative. The results to this question are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Results of Question 1: *What do you believe to be the primary function of the Pupil Assistance Committee?*

	School One (n=11)	School Two (n=11)	District (n=22)
Academic Concerns:	60%	40%	50%
Address Behavioral Concerns:	20%	20%	20%
Child Study Team Related	20%	30%	25%
To Help Parents		10%	5%

Question 2: How often do you refer a student to PAC?

Very similar numbers were collected from both School One and School Two Schools. Most teachers stated that they referred less than once a year, with a very similar number referring 2-3 times a year. Those teachers who responded with less than once a year, may never refer. Only 10% stated once a year. It seems to be an all or nothing. Some teachers do not seem to use the PAC, while others use it frequently or as needed. These results can be seen in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Results of Question 2: How often do you refer a student to PAC?

	School One (n=11)	School Two (n=11)	District (n=22)
Less than once a year	40%	40%	40%
Once a year	10%	10%	10%
2-3 times a year	40%	30%	35%
As needed	10%	20%	15%

Question 3: What types of problems would you refer to PAC?

The majority of teachers mentioned academic concerns as well as behavioral concerns. Both schools and the district in general agree that these are the two areas of concern. Most of the respondents identified both academic and behavioral as problem areas that they would refer to PAC. Only one teacher from School One named academic as the only reason she would refer. Those respondents who listed social reasons had also listed academic and behavioral concerns. The respondent who listed speech problems as an area of concern had also listed behavior and academic reasons as the basis for referral to PAC. Table 3 displays these results.

TABLE 3. Results of Question 3: What types of problems would you refer to PAC?

	School One (n=11)	School Two (n=11)	District (n=22)
Academic	45%	40%	42%
Behavioral	35%	40%	38%
Social	10%	20%	15%
Speech	5%	0%	3%

Question 4: When you referred a student to PAC, what types of interventions were implemented?

The results of this question address the research question, “What pre-referral strategies are used most frequently”. These responses come from the teachers, not the actual PAC records. According to the teachers reminiscences, the most used interventions are, tutoring, homework club and mentoring. Summer school is also listed as an intervention in 10% of the cases, as is counseling, as seen in Table 4.

TABLE 4. Results of Question 4: *When you referred a student to PAC, what types of interventions were implemented?*

	School One (n=11)	School Two (n=11)	District (n=22)
Tutor	23%	0%	13%
Homework Club	14%	6%	10%
Mentor	14%	6%	10%
CST Referral	10%	0%	5%
Counseling	5%	12%	10%
Classwork modifications	5%	6%	5%
Behavior Modifications	0%	17%	10%
Teacher signs homework planner	0%	12%	5%
Summer School	14%	6%	10%
Parent Involvement	0%	6%	3%
Other	0%	12%	5%
NA	14%	17%	15%

Question 5: What interventions do you feel were the most effective?

Tutoring and homework club emerged as the most effective interventions mentioned by the respondents. Child Study Team referral was also considered an effective intervention by teachers from both schools. Nine percent of the teachers in the district report that no effective interventions were given. District-wide 25% of the respondents' answers were placed under the category of "Other" because these interventions were all very child or teacher specific. Some of these included medical intervention, parent involvement, and moving a child to a lower grade math group.

Table 5. Results of Question 5: *What interventions do you feel were the most effective?*

	School One (n=11)	School Two (n=11)	District (n=22)
Tutoring	25%	13%	19%
Homework Club	19%	19%	19%
CST Referral	13%	13%	13%
None	6%	13%	9%
Other	31%	19%	25%
Unsure	6%	25%	16%

Question 6: Do you feel PAC is a useful tool or a roadblock to CST?

Twice as many School One teachers reported that they felt PAC was a roadblock to CST than did the School Two Teachers. Also, twice as many School Two Teachers felt that PAC was a useful tool. Nine percent of the respondents were not sure how they

felt about PAC because of a lack of experience with PAC. Two research questions are addressed by this survey question: “Are PAC’s useful in preventing referral to special education?” and “Is PAC merely a hurdle between the student and special education referral?”. According to the overall responses, a significant portion (48%) of the teachers feel that PAC is a hurdle while 43% feel it is a useful tool. The district nearly evenly divided when answering this question. Further analysis of the records does show that the school that implemented the most prereferral strategies did have a somewhat lower classification rate (See Table 13).

TABLE 6. Results of Question 6: *Do you feel PAC is a useful tool or a roadblock to CST?*

	School One (n=11)	School Two (n=11)	District(n=22)
Roadblock	64%	33%	48%
Useful Tool	27%	58%	43%
Unsure	9%	9%	9%

Question 7: If you were able to have input on how the PAC’s functioned, what type of suggestions would you make?

Ninety-one percent of the respondents from School One had suggestions for their PAC, while only 64% of the respondents from School Two made suggestions. On the rating scale, when asked the question: “I would make changes to the PAC if I could”,

40% of the respondents from School One said that they disagreed with this statement, yet more than twice that many did make suggestions. Sixty percent of the respondents from School Two stated that they would not make changes, yet a similar number actually did make suggestions. These suggestions ranged from ideas on time frames, intervention ideas, monitoring of interventions, collaboration with other districts and comments on how to shorten or eliminate the PAC process.

Results of Rating Scale

A portion of the survey from Appendix B contained statements in which the respondent chose a number from a likert scale which best expressed their opinion as follows:

Likert Scale Key

- 1=Strongly Agree
- 2=Agree
- 3=Disagree
- 4=Strongly Disagree

A column for Not Applicable was added to account for those respondents wrote this in. The results are broken down by statement and reported by school and by district.

Statement 1: I am satisfied with the way PAC functions in my building>

Generally, the staff at School One appear to be unhappy with the way their PAC functions. Only 10% of the respondents answered positively about the PAC, 70 % responded that they disagreed with the statement while one strongly disagreed. Quite the opposite was true of the School Two staff. Seventy percent of those respondents were satisfied with 20% of the 70% stating they strongly agreed. Only 20% were dissatisfied with the functioning of their PAC. When looking at the figures for the entire district, it appears that the respondents are split on whether they are satisfied or not, with 40%

satisfied, 50 dissatisfied and 10% NA. But, when looking at the disparity between the two buildings, this comment it cannot be generalized and needs to be analyzed separately. These results are stated in Table 7.

TABLE 7. Results of Statement 1: *I am satisfied with how the PAC functions in my building.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NA
	1	2	3	4	NA
School One	0%	10%	70%	10%	10%
School Two	20%	50%	20%	0%	10%
District	10%	30%	45%	5%	10%

Statement 2: I believe the appropriate personnel serve on the PAC.

School One respondents appear split on whether they feel the appropriate people serve on the PAC with 50% agreeing and 40% disagreeing. School Two feels more positively towards the personnel on their PAC, with 72% agreeing, and only 18% disagreeing. 36% of that 72% strongly agree that the right people serve on the PAC. When looking at this statement district-wide, it appears that the staff is generally comfortable with those serving on the PAC. The disparity between the schools may be related to personality conflicts or with general dissatisfaction as to how well the PAC functions. The research question “What professionals should sit on the PAC?” is not answered directly, but rather is interpreted from the data. Since most of the teachers reported agree that the appropriate personnel sit on the PAC, and since there were no

recommendations for changes in personnel, it can be assumed that the make-up used in this district is appropriate. It consists of a principal, child study team member, a guidance counselor and a regular education teacher.

TABLE 8. Statement 2: *I believe the appropriate personnel serve on the PAC.*

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	
	1	2	3	4	NA
School One	10%	40%	20%	20%	10%
School Two	36%	36%	18%	0%	9%
District	24%	38%	19%	9%	9%

Statement 3: I would make changes in the PAC if I could.

Fifty percent of School One teachers would make changes if they could, while 40% would not. This number is low when compared to the 80% of School One teachers who expressed dissatisfaction as to the way their PAC functions. School Two teachers responded more heavily not to make changes, with 60% not agreeing with the statement. This closely correlates with the percentage of teachers satisfied with their PAC. As a district, 45% of the teachers who responded would make changes if they could while 50% would not. 5% of the teachers did not respond to the statement either positively or negatively. These results can be seen in Table 9.

TABLE 9. Statement 3: *I would make changes in the PAC if I could.*

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	
	1	2	3	4	NA
School One	20%	30%	30%	10%	10%
School Two	10%	30%	50%	10%	0%
District	15%	30%	40%	10%	5%

Statement 4: When attending a Pac meeting as a teacher, I feel I am respected as a professional.

Half of the School One teachers who responded to the survey felt that they were treated as professional, 20% felt that they were not treated as professionals while 30% did not feel this statement applied to them. School Two teachers felt strongly that they were treated as professionals, with 64% of the respondents agreeing strongly with the statement and 18% agreeing. Only 9% of the respondents felt that they were not treated as a professional. Taking the district as a whole, 67% of the respondents felt that they were treated as professionals during PAC meetings, 14% felt they were not and 19% felt that they did not have the experience with PAC to respond to the statement.

TABLE 10. Results of Statement 4: *When attending a PAC meeting as the teacher, I feel I am respected as a professional*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
	1	2	3	4	NA
School One	20%	30%	20%	0%	30%
School Two	64%	18%	9%	0%	9%
District	43%	24%	14%	0%	19%

Statement 5: I only refer to PAC when I feel a CST evaluation is warranted.

At School One, 60% of respondents strongly agree with the statement that they only refer to PAC when CST evaluation is warranted, while 10% agree. Only 10% from School One do not agree with this statement, with 20% feeling this statement did not apply to them. School Two teachers, on the other hand, are more split in their feelings about CST referral. 45 % of the teachers agree with the statement, while 45 % disagree with the statements, with 9% stating it was not applicable. As a district, more teachers feel that they only refer to PAC when they feel that CST referral is warranted. Responses are shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11. Results of Statement 5: *I only refer to PAC when I feel a CST evaluation is warranted*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
	1	2	3	4	NA
School One	60%	10%	0%	10%	20%
School Two	18%	27%	36%	9%	9%
District	38%	19%	19%	9%	14%

Analysis of PAC Records from Principals

Both PAC committees are run by the building principals. Both principals opened their records for analysis. The only available data was for three years for School One and for two years for School Two. Since the final outcome of the 2002-2003 school year is not available, only data from the 2001-2002 school year was used for this report.

Of the 31 students referred to PAC at School One, 45% were referred to the Child Study Team. Of those referred to the Child Study Team, 77% were ultimately classified by the end of the 2002 school year. Therefore, at School One, in the school year 2001-2002, a student referred to PAC had a 36 % chance of being classified.

Of the 17 students referred to PAC at School Two, 53% were referred to the Child Study Team. Of those referred to the CST, 88% of the students were classified by the end of the 2002 school year. Therefore, at School Two, in the school year 2001-2002, a student referred to PAC had a 47% chance of being classified.

For this district as a whole, a student referred to PAC in the 2001-2002 school year, had a 39% chance of being classified by the end of the school year, as shown in Table 13.

TABLE 12. Numbers of Students Referred to PAC, Subsequently Referred to CST and Classified.

	School One	School Two	District
Number of Students Referred to PAC:	31	17	48
Number of Students Referred to CST	14	9	23
Number of Students Classified	11	8	19

TABLE 13. Percentage of Students That Are Classified After Referral To PAC

School One	36%
School Two	47%
District	39%

In reviewing the types of interventions and outcomes according to the principal's records, there are some variations between the schools as to how the referrals are handled. At School One, only 6 % of the students were referred directly to the Child Study Team, with one of them being a request from the parent. At School Two, 41% of the PAC referrals went directly to the CST. Since School One had a lower classification rate as compared to PAC referrals, it may be assumed that some of the interventions may have worked or may have delayed classification.

The School One PAC used tutoring as an intervention in 35% of their referrals. Guidance was recommended in 19% of the referrals at that school. Parent contact was attempted or made in all but 6 % of the referrals. School Two PAC's primary recommendation was Child Study Team referral. Behavior modification was listed as an intervention in 18% of the referrals with other interventions being more individualized.

From analysis of the data, it appears that tutoring may be a factor in preventing or delaying classification. Of those students who were tutored at School One, 34% were classified by the end of the school year. This number is somewhat higher than the PAC-referred students who were not tutored. In this case, 47% Of the students were classified. In looking to address the research question, "What pre-referral strategies produce the most positive results?", tutoring would have to be considered the most effective for School One. Not enough information was available from the School Two because the Child Study Team referral was their most used intervention.

The rate of referral to the Child Study Team appears to be the best indicator as to whether or not an intervention was successful. It is the most accurate data available. This

addresses the research question, "How can the success or failure of PAC strategies be assessed?". Accurate and prolonged record keeping is the key to know whether or not a referral was really successful.

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusion, Discussions and Implications

Summary

Literature related to Pupil Assistance Committees indicates they were established to increase the capacity of regular education to serve pupils with learning and behavior problems without labeling them as handicapped. New Jersey mandates the establishment of Intervention and Referral Services which are “ a coordinated system in each building for the planning and delivery of intervention and referral services designed to assist students who are experiencing learning, behavior and health difficulties and to assist staff who have difficulties in addressing students’ learning, behavior or health needs”.

(N.J.A.C. 6A: 16-7.1)

The purpose of this study was to identify effective model of a Pupil Assistance Committee/Intervention and Referral Service, and to determine what types of interventions are most successful and what are the most important benefits of an effective Pupil Assistance Committee (PAC). A specific district, with two Kindergartens through Fourth Grade PAC’s in effect was examined to determine types of referrals made to the PAC, as well as the interventions recommended. Subsequent Referrals to Child Study

Team were also tracked to determine effectiveness and appropriateness of the interventions. The teachers' perceptions of their building's PAC services were surveyed and a list of recommendations created based on the information gathered.

The results of the survey noted inconsistency between the two schools of teachers' perceptions of the usefulness and effectiveness of PAC's. Teachers' perceptions were found to be positive if referral to the Child Study Team was expedited. There was also inconsistency between the two schools as to the team's practices related to parental contact and types of interventions implemented. Tutoring was found to be the most often recommended and easily documented intervention, as well as the intervention that achieved the most positive results. Based on the literature review and the results of this study, a coordinated PAC reform is warranted for the district involved in this study.

Conclusion

The results of this study show that the criteria used to measure the effectiveness of an effective PAC is based upon the number of referrals to the Child Study Team. It was found that tutoring was the most successful intervention when using this criterion, but was not used to the same degree in both schools. It was noted that the teacher's perceptions of their PAC, how it runs and the personnel involved was much more favorable at the school that used referral to Child Study Teams as their most-used intervention. Comments from the respondents at the school that implemented more pre-referral strategies before referring to the Child Study Team were often related to dissatisfaction with these delays to the Child Study Team. These teachers considered

PAC to be a roadblock to the Child Study Team rather, rather than a useful vehicle. They did not feel they were respected as professionals during PAC meetings. Comments noted that the teachers felt that they would only make a PAC referral after they had exhausted all necessary interventions. They felt that their professional judgment should be respected when it concerns what is an appropriate referral to the Child Study Team.

Suggestions were also made to follow-up cases referred to the PAC by assigning of case managers. From the survey, there was no clear consensus on which interventions were considered the most effective, although tutoring and homework club were mentioned by teachers from both schools as their most effective interventions. When examining at the district as a whole, 25% of the teachers listed successful interventions that were very child or teacher specific. This points to the idea that the teachers are satisfied with interventions they feel are individualized and creative.

Although there was some dissatisfaction with the personnel who served on the PAC's, the district was generally satisfied. There were no suggestions listed by the respondents related to personnel changes. Therefore, it may be assumed that the model chosen by the school district, one headed by the principal with a variety of other disciplines as part of the team, is appropriate for this school district.

Discussions and Implications

Pupil Assistance Committees, although state mandated, can be organized and function differently not only at the school district level, but also at the building level. This study was conducted using two functioning PAC's. There was socio-economic

disparity between the two schools, with the less satisfied teachers coming from the lower SES school. This school has had a number of students transferring from school districts of even lower socio economic status. Tutoring was frequently named as an intervention in the principal's report and may be related to the need to give these new students a chance to catch up before referring them to the Child Study Team. Poor previous instruction needed to be ruled out before assuming a learning impairment. Although tutoring was listed as the most frequently used and most effective intervention, a longitudinal study would have to be conducted to determine if the tutoring merely delayed rather than prevented eligibility for special education.

The small sample size, with about a 30% response rate, may have had some effect on the results of the surveys. The cover letter that accompanied the survey was from the principal and stated that they were seeking to improve their Pupil Assistance Committees. The sample may have been skewed by the fact that it was only those teachers that had strong feelings one way or another about PAC completed the surveys. Less open-ended questions in the survey would have made data collection much simpler. If the principals had used the same record keeping system, it would have been easier to track the students' progress and eventual determination. Data could only be obtained from one full school year because of inconsistent record keeping. Because neither school had records of case management, there is little way of knowing what interventions were actually carried out and to what extent. The only interventions that have records are tutoring (payroll vouchers) and counseling (student logs). In reviewing the literature, it was found that the fidelity of interventions in one study was very low. For example,

teachers in one study only carried out interventions 4% of the time. This finding supports the need for accountability.

Recommendations for Improvement of the Pupil Assistance Committee Involved in this Study

1. Due to the teachers' negative image of the Pupil Assistance Committee, it is recommended that the name be changed to something that better defines the role of this service in a more positive light. The teachers need to see this service as a support for themselves as well as the students. This name change should be implemented district wide due to movement of students from one school to the other.
2. Coordination of the service model is also recommended. Use of the same forms, database and recording system is essential. Use of the same names for services can make the database run smoother for better tracking of students. For instance, Guidance Referral or Counseling should be used but not both, as the database would count this as two separate services.
3. The assignment of case managers would lighten the load of the principals and allow for better assurance of the fidelity of interventions. Certain cases need to be closely case-managed in order for interventions to be effective.

4. Allow time in the case managers schedules to monitor students.
Possibly replacing playground or hallway duties would free up enough time.
5. It may help to schedule PAC meetings in clusters, when substitutes can be brought in to assure that appropriate personnel are in attendance.
6. Special educators, nurses and people of various disciplines add important perspectives to a PAC meeting and should be included more frequently.
7. A flyer or brochure “selling” PAC to parents, teachers and students should be published under the new name of the service. It should be given to each teacher, at back to school night and through the mail when parents are notified that their child has been referred to the committee.

References

Burns, Matthew K., Effectiveness of Special Education Personnel in the Intervention Assistance Team Model, *Journal of Educational Research*, July/August 1999, Volume 92, Issue 6

Chalfant, James C. and Van Dusen Pysh, Margaret, Teacher Assistance Teams: Five Descriptive Studies on 96 Teams, *Remedial and Special Education*, Volume 10, Issue 6, November/December 1989

Christiansen, Jeanne, Helping Teachers Meet the Needs of Students at Risk for School Failure, *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, February 1997, Volume 31, Issue 3

Hammond, Helen and Ingals, Lawrence, Maintaining School Based Pre-Referral Teams: An Eight Year Study, *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, Spring 1999, Volume 18, Issue 2

Myers, Valerie M. and Kline, Charles E., Secondary School Intervention Assistance Teams: Can They Be Effective? *High School Journal*, December 2001, January 2002, Volume 85, Issue 2

Naquin, Gale M. and Adler, Yvonne, Pre-Referral Strategies: Student Study Teams, In Case, March-April 2002

Ormsbee, Christine K.; Haring, Kathryn A., Rural Assessment Team Members Perceptions of Effectiveness, *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, Winter 2000, Volume 19, Issue 1

Shriner, James G., and Spicuzza, Richard J., Procedural Considerations in the Assessment of Students at Risk for School Failure, *Preventing School Failure*, Winter 1995, Volume 39, Issue 2

Sofran, Stephen P and Sofran, Joan S., Intervention Assistance Programs and Pre-Referral Teams, *Remedial and Special Education*, November 1996, Volume 17, Issue 6

Whitten, Elizabeth and Dieker, Lisa, Intervention and Assistance Teams: A Broader Vision, *Preventing School Failure*, Fall 1995, Volume 40, Issue 1

Association of School Psychologists, Position Paper on the Revision of Pennsylvania Special Education Regulations, www.home.duq.edu/~kush/position.html

Salgado, Luis J., Assistant Commissioner, Division of Educational Programs and Student Services to Chief School Administrators, Subject: Pupil Assistance Committee Regulations (NJAC 6: 26 et seq), September 14, 1992

APPENDIX A

INTERVENTION AND REFERRAL SERVICES
FOR GENERAL EDUCATION PUPILS
N.J.A.C. 6:26-1.1

SUBCHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

6.26-1.1 Purpose

The purpose of these rules is to provide for the district boards of education for the delivery of intervention and referral services for pupils in the general education program.

SUBCHAPTER 2. DISTRICT PROCEDURES

6.26-2.1 District procedures

- a) District boards of education shall establish and implement procedures in each school building for the delivery of intervention and referral services for pupils who are experiencing difficulties in their classes and who have not been determined to be in need of special to be in need of special education programs and services pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:46-18.1 et seq. and N.J.A.C. 6:28 by September 1994. The district shall:
1. Identify pupils in need, and plan and provide for appropriate intervention or referral services and/or referral to school and community resources, based on desired outcomes;
 2. Identify the roles and responsibilities of the building staff who participate in planning and providing intervention and referral services;
 3. Provide support, guidance, and professional development to school staff who identify and refer pupils and to school staff who participate in planning and providing intervention and referral services plans;
 4. Actively involve parents or guardians in the development and implementation of intervention and referral services plans;
 5. Coordinate the access to and delivery of school services for identified pupils;
 6. Coordinate the services of community-based social and health provider agencies; and
 7. Review and assess the effectiveness of the services provided in achieving the outcomes identified in the intervention and referral plan.

APPENDIX B

PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE SURVEY

1. What do you believe to be the primary function of the Pupil Assistance Committee?
2. How often do you refer a student to PAC?
3. What types of problems would you refer to PAC?
4. When you have referred a student(s) to PAC, what types of strategies were implemented?
5. What types of strategies do you feel were the most effective?
6. Do you feel PAC is a useful tool or a roadblock to CST?
7. If you were able to have input on how the PAC's functioned, what types of suggestions would you make (personnel, strategies offered, types of problems addressed). Keep in mind that there is money available for PAC and that outside resources or agencies may be considered. (Feel free to use the back of this paper).

Please circle 1-4 based upon the following criteria.

1= strongly agree

2= somewhat agree

3=somewhat disagree

4= strongly disagree.

I am satisfied with how the PAC functions in my building. 1 2 3 4

I believe the appropriate personnel serve on the PAC 1 2 3 4

I would make changes in the PAC if I could. 1 2 3 4

When attending a PAC meeting as the teacher, I feel I am respected as a professional. 1 2 3 4

I only refer to PAC when I think CST evaluation is warranted. 1 2 3 4

Additional comments: